



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/970,702	10/05/2001	Hajime Takei	018656-252	1791	
75	7590 04/19/2006			EXAMINER	
Platon N. Mandros			MURPHY,	MURPHY, DILLON J	
BURNS, DOAN	NE, SWECKER & MAT	HIS, L.L.P.			
P.O. Box 1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404			2625		
			DATE MAILED: 04/19/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/970,702	TAKEI ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Dillon J. Murphy	2625				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe			ress			
THE REPLY FILED 10 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following rime periods: The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 						
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 						
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet. KING Y. POON PRIMARY EXAMINER						

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant argues, on pages 1-2 of Remarks, filed April 10, 2006, that Hansen does not teach a "sorting means for... separating the finishing specifics included in the job ticket received by the receiving means into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device."

The examiner respectfully disagrees, citing the Cambridge Dictionary Online for the definition of sorting: "to put a number of things in order or to separated them into groups" and separating: "to divide into parts". The printing system of Hansen teaches sorting for separating finishing specifics in Hansen, col 7, In 30-42, and especially In 32-36, wherein print jobs are spooled and queued based on attributes of print jobs (i.e. a job ticket) and how those attributes are satisfied by the print engine (i.e. based upon the specification and installed options of the printer and of the finishing device). Various means are provided in order to separate finishing specifics into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device. As previously mentioned, printing specifics and finishing specifics are inherently separated by virtue of being queued to different devices. Based upon the attributes of the printer, the printer specifics are performed while passing the remaining part of the job ticket is preformed by the finishing device. As seen in Hansen, col 7, In 15-20, some devices do not support electronice transfer and therefore the finishing specifics must be separated between those that may be performed by the printing device to produce a partially finished document, and those to be performed by the finishing device to provide a special binding process. Additionally, in col 7, In 36-38, it is possible to split color from black and white jobs, thereby separating the finishing specifics for those respective sub jobs.

Applicants remarks are not persuasive, and the claimed limitations of the finally rejected claims are still met by the prior art of record..